

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PU030295  
Final Office Action dated: 02/02/10

PATENT

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 08 2010

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application, and are rejected in the final Office Action of February 2, 2010. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 10 and 12-14 are amended herein to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention.

Re: Patentability of Claims 1-4, 6, 13-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6, 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,371,551 issued to Logan et al. (hereinafter, "Logan") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0075983 by Stencyk et al. (hereinafter, "Stencyk"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants first note that independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites:

"A method for operating a television apparatus having a digital serial bus connection and one or more other connections to enable a recording function, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving, by the television apparatus, a user input;

detecting, by the television apparatus, if a video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections is available in response to the user input;

if a video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections is available, causing, by the television apparatus, a digital recording device to record digital content provided from the video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections in response to the user input;

if a video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections is not available, detecting, by the television apparatus, if a video input source device corresponding to the digital serial bus connection is available;

if a video input source device corresponding to the digital serial bus connection is available, performing steps comprising:

establishing, by the television apparatus, a peer-to-peer connection between the video input source device corresponding to the digital serial bus connection and the digital recording device in response to the user input; and

causing, by the television apparatus, the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the video input source device corresponding to the digital serial bus connection in response to the user input, wherein data is directly transferred between the video input source device corresponding to the digital serial bus connection and the digital recording device."

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PU030295  
Final Office Action dated: 02/02/10

PATENT

As indicated above, amended independent claim 1 defines a recording solution for a television apparatus having at least two different types of connections, namely a digital serial bus connection and one or more other types of connections. One notable feature of the claimed recording solution is that a single "user input" can be used to enable recording via the digital serial bus connection, or the one or more other connections. Another notable feature of the claimed recording solution involves a priority scheme, wherein recording is first attempted using the one or more other connections versus the digital serial bus connection. In particular, if a video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections is available, the television apparatus causes a digital recording device to record digital content provided from the video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections in response to the single "user input".

Alternatively, if a video input source device corresponding to one of the other connections is not available, the television apparatus attempts a recording process via the digital serial bus connection. Here, the recording process via the digital serial bus connection advantageously involves at least three different functions being performed in response to the single "user input", namely, the functions of: (i) selecting a video input source device, (ii) establishing a peer-to-peer connection between the selected video input source device and the digital recording device; and (iii) causing the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the selected video input source device, wherein data is directly transferred between the selected video input source device and the digital recording device.

Independent claim 13 recites subject matter similar to independent claim 1, as described above. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1 and 13 may be found, for example, in the flowchart of FIG. 6 in Applicants' specification. Accordingly, no new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Neither Logan nor Stecyk, whether taken individually or in combination, discloses or suggests each and every feature of the recording solution defined by independent claims 1 and 13. In the final Office Action dated February 2, 2010, the Examiner alleges that the primary reference, Logan, discloses various features of the claimed invention.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PU030295  
Final Office Action dated: 02/02/10

PATENT

In response, Applicants note that Logan discloses a broadcast recording and playback device employing a circular buffer memory which constantly records one or more incoming audio or video program signals and a microprocessor for reading a playback signal from the circular buffer memory to display programming material delayed from its receipt by a selectable delay interval. A plurality of input signal processors provides one or more programming signals to the circular buffer memory in compressed digital form and a separate output signal processor converts the compressed digital information read from the circular buffer memory into a form suitable for display. The device operates under the control of the microprocessor which accepts commands from a remote command device or a connected host computer (see, for example, the Abstract).

However, Applicants submit that Logan fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed recording solution for a television apparatus having at least two different types of connections, namely a digital serial bus connection and one or more other types of connections, in which a single "user input" can be used to enable recording via the digital serial bus connection, or the one or more other connections. Logan also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the aforementioned priority scheme of the claimed recording solution, wherein recording is first attempted using the one or more other connections versus the digital serial bus connection.

The secondary reference, Stecyk, is unable to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Logan. In particular, Stecyk discloses a control system and user interface for a network of input devices. However, like Logan, Stecyk also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed recording solution for a television apparatus having at least two different types of connections, namely a digital serial bus connection and one or more other types of connections, in which a single "user input" can be used to enable recording via the digital serial bus connection, or the one or more other connections. Stecyk also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the aforementioned priority scheme of the claimed recording solution, wherein recording is first attempted using the one or more other connections versus the digital serial bus connection. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Logan and Stecyk were combined, the resulting combination would not produce the claimed recording solution defined by independent claims 1 and 13.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PU030295  
Final Office Action dated: 02/02/10

PATENT

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 13 and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the proposed combination of Logan and Stecyk, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Re: Patentability of Claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Stecyk, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,882 issued to Geer et al. (hereinafter, "Geer"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Geer is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Logan and Stecyk pointed out above in connection with independent claims 1 and 13 (from which claims 5 and 15 respectively depend). In particular, Geer discloses a digital video recorder that is capable of concurrently receiving and digitally storing a plurality of channels (see, for example, the Abstract). However, like Logan and Stecyk, Geer also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed recording solution for a television apparatus having at least two different types of connections, namely a digital serial bus connection and one or more other types of connections, in which a single "user input" can be used to enable recording via the digital serial bus connection, or the one or more other connections. Geer also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the aforementioned priority scheme of the claimed recording solution, wherein recording is first attempted using the one or more other connections versus the digital serial bus connection. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Logan, Stecyk and Geer were combined, the resulting combination would not produce the claimed recording solution defined by independent claims 1 and 13 (from which claims 5 and 15 ultimately depend). Accordingly, claims 5 and 15 are deemed patentable over the proposed combination of Logan, Stecyk and Geer, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Re: Patentability of Claims 7-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 7-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,328 issued to Elliot et al.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PLU030295  
Final Office Action dated: 02/02/10

PATENT

(hereinafter, "Elliot"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants first note that independent claim 7 is amended herein to define the claimed recording solution in a manner similar to independent claims 1 and 13. Moreover, Elliot is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Logan pointed out above in connection with independent claims 1 and 13. In particular, Elliot discloses a system including a set-top box 100 connectable to a digital video recorder 200 (see FIG. 1-3). Digital video recorder 200 receives a real-time video signal 106 from set-top box 100 and provides a recorded video signal 108 to set-top box 100 during a playback interval. Digital video recorder 200 also includes a disk 220 and a video data stream manager 230 that in response to real-time video signal 106 provides a first video stream 222 to store a selected video segment on disk 220. Video data stream manager 230, in response to commands from a microprocessor 140 in set-top box 100, receives a second video stream 223 based on the selected video segment stored on disk 220 to generate recorded video signal 108. Set-top box 100 also includes a multiplexer 150 that selects real-time video signal 106 during a real-time interval and selects recorded video signal 108 during the playback interval to generate an output video data stream to a display device 300 (see, for example, the Abstract, FIGS. 1-3 and their accompanying descriptions).

However, Elliot clearly fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed recording solution for a television apparatus having at least two different types of connections, namely a digital serial bus connection and one or more other types of connections, in which a single "user input" can be used to enable recording via the digital serial bus connection, or the one or more other connections. Elliot also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the aforementioned priority scheme of the claimed recording solution, wherein recording is first attempted using the one or more other connections versus the digital serial bus connection. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Logan and Elliot were combined, the resulting combination would not produce the claimed recording solution defined by independent claim 7. Accordingly, claims 7-10 and 12 are deemed patentable over the proposed combination of Logan and Elliot, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

PATENT

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PU030295  
Final Office Action dated: 02/02/10

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks/arguments and accompanying amendments, the Applicants believe this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled. Please charge the fee for the RCE to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD ANDREW LE FEVRE ET AL.

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul P. Kiel, Attorney  
Reg. No. 40,677  
Phone (609) 734-6815

Date: 4/8/10

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312